



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

sity and worthiness be made Bishop. The assertions respecting Josiah and Joash rest upon quite definite biblical dates (see II Kgs. XI. 4; XXII. 1); but upon what is the first, that concerning Solomon, founded? By further investigations, it has been found not to be so isolated as it at first appeared to be. A neighboring Jewish teacher informed me that a Hebrew commentary *מנחה קטנה* (I Kgs. II. 2) interprets *והיית לאיש*: "Thou wilt become a man. Solomon was as yet not *איש* [a man], nor *בר מצוה* [son of commandment, confirmed], he was only in his twelfth year." This statement is also made by the ablest Jewish commentator<sup>1</sup>, Raschi, who bases it upon the following computation:

Solomon's birth, (II Sam. XII. 24), and Amnon's infamous treatment of Tamar (II Sam. XIII), occurred at the same time (because they are related, the one immediately after the other?).

To the murder of Amnon (XIII, 23), 2 years.

Absalom's residence in Geshur vs. 38, 3 years.

Absalom's residence in Jerusalem (XIV. 28) to the time of his rebellion, 2 years.

Famine during the time of David, (XXI. 1), 3 years.

In the eleventh year of Solomon, the numbering of Israel [by David] which (XIV. 28) lasted nine months.

In the twelfth year, David gave his last mandates. Such an age as this does not, however, fit the idea which must, according to the books of Kings, be had of Solomon at his accession to the throne. But how comes the Apostolical Constitutions by its account? Is it also to be met with elsewhere? Josephus says<sup>2</sup>: And Solomon dies, being already aged, having reigned 80 years and having lived 94 years.

[I Kgs. XIV. 21 and XI. 42 certainly indicate an age of twenty years or upward, possibly somewhat under twenty, surely more than twelve. The computation of Raschi can only rest upon the supposition that the narrative in Samuel includes all the events of David's reign and relates them in exact chronological order. F]. From the German of E. Nestle, *Zeitschrift fuer die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.

<sup>1</sup> Art. *Solomon*, Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie.

<sup>2</sup> P. 403. In evident disagreement with this statement is that on p. 330, in which his birth is removed to the third decade of David's reign.

<sup>3</sup> Apostolical Constitutions II. (Ed. Lagarde 14, 17).

<sup>4</sup> Rabbi Solomon Isaac of Troyes † 1105.

<sup>5</sup> *Archaeol.* 8, 7. 8.

**הִלַּךְ AND יָלַךְ.**—Most of the grammarians assume, as is known, that with respect to the stem-form and inflection of the Hebrew verb for *go*, two parallel roots unite by metaplasm. Müller assumes (§ 96) that **הִלַּךְ** springs from **יָלַךְ** by the change from u to h. But an old root **יָלַךְ, יִלַּךְ** *go* is not elsewhere found in the Semitic. Consequently other grammarians have attempted to trace back to **הִלַּךְ** those forms which appear to belong to the assumed root **יָלַךְ, יִלַּךְ**. I believe that these last are upon the right course, but they have not yet pushed on to the starting-point of the divergence.

This starting-point is the causative. Originally it must have been pronounced **הִהֲלִיךְ** in the perfect, hence with h at the beginning and at the end of the same

syllable. The tendency to dissimilarity put aside the has the closing sound, and this made necessary the lengthening of the preceding  $\ddot{a}$  to  $\hat{a}$  and the succeeding change of  $\hat{a}$  into  $\hat{o}$ . This  $\hat{o}$  arising from  $\hat{a}$  was regarded as coming from  $au$ , and thus the way was opened for the construction of new forms after the manner of verbs originally  $\text{פ"פ}^2$ .

It is hardly necessary to call attention to the fact, that the same phenomenon of a tendency to dissimilarity [in the initial and final sounds of a syllable] is present here in the case of  $\text{ה}$  as is familiar in the  $\text{א}$  of verbs  $\text{פ"א}$ . In these latter, it is well known that the first person singular, imperfect Qäl, as  $\text{אכל, אחז}$  does not depend upon the same steps as the other persons, e. g.  $\text{יאכל, תאחז}$ . In the first forms, the invariable orthography, with only one  $\text{א}$ , indicates that the second  $\text{א}$  which closed the syllable, disappeared very early<sup>3</sup>.

Should any one, perchance with a view to the rejection of this explanation of the theme  $\text{ילך}$ , suggest a question as to why this secondary theme has not pressed itself into the perfect Qäl, I would reply by asking why the secondary theme  $\text{יטב}$ , which sprung similarly from  $\text{טוב}$ , is restricted to the imperfect Qäl.

Beside  $\text{הלך}$ , there is in Hebrew only one verb occurring in the causative, which has in its root an initial  $\text{ה}$  and a medial strong radical, viz.  $\text{הפך}$ ; and this is found (Job. xxx 15) in the perfect Hôph'al,  $\text{הִפֵּךְ}$ . In this form, therefore, the etymological consciousness has triumphed over the tendency to dissimilarity which demanded  $\text{הופך}$ . Nevertheless there also appears in this verb the same differentiation of sound as takes place with  $\text{הלך}$ . Geiger says<sup>4</sup>: " $\text{הפך}$  makes many forms from  $\text{יִפֵּךְ}$  in the Hîph'il, thus  $\text{יִפֵּךְ}$ ." To judge from the examples which both Geiger and Levy<sup>5</sup> give, the Hîph'il has a technical, agricultural signification, to *plough up*. These examples are, indeed, not beyond doubt, for nowhere do we meet with a decisive Hîph'il as  $\text{יִפֵּךְ, הופֵּךְ}$ . We have only such forms as  $\text{יִפֵּךְ, אופֵּך}$ , which if in the Hiphil could only be taken as Jussive, but as such would not fit well into the context. Hence Levy refers them to the otherwise un-Hebraic root  $\text{אפך}$ , from which they may be made as Qäl imperfects, after the manner of verbs  $\text{פ"פ}$ <sup>6</sup>. I suggest that the form of the Jussive Hîph'il,  $\text{יִפֵּךְ}$ , which is exactly similar to an imperfect Qäl  $\text{פ"פ}$ , has caused confusion in the speech because a causative signification is not definitely indicated in the form.—*From the German of Franz Praetorius, Zeitschrift fuer die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

<sup>1</sup> Ewald, *Hebraische Sprache des Alten Bundes*, 8th edition, § 117. c; Gesenius, *Grammar*, 23d edition, § 69, Remark 8.

<sup>2</sup> [The changes suggested by the author are:  $\text{הִלֵּךְ, הִלֵּךְ, הִלֵּךְ, הִלֵּךְ}$ . F.]

<sup>3</sup> Nöldeke in *Zeitschrift fuer die Morgenlaendische Gesellschaft*, XXXII, 593; Fleischer zu De Sacy I, § 136.

<sup>4</sup> *Lehrbuch zur Sprache der Mishnah*, § 18. 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Neuheb. und Chald. Woerterbuch*, I. 143.

<sup>6</sup> [The regular forms for the imperfect Qäl of this verb as  $\text{פ"פ}$ , would be:  $\text{אִפֵּךְ, אִפֵּךְ}$ ; but the  $\text{א}$  is often omitted, and in a few instances  $\text{י}$  is inserted. See Green's Gram., § 111. 1. b, and Gesenius' Gram., § 68. 2 Rem. Omission of  $\text{א}$  and insertion of  $\text{י}$  would give  $\text{יִפֵּךְ, אִפֵּך}$  as Qäl imperfects. F.]